Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-

27 are presented for examination.

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over

Maheshwari et al. (WO 01/06374) in view of Healy et al. (WO/01/09789). Applicants

submit that the present claims are patentable over the combination of Maheshwari and Healy.

Maheshwari discloses systems and methods for using a trusted storage system in an

untrusted environment. The system includes a trusted database system is provided that

leverages a trusted processing environment and a small amount of trusted storage to provide

tamper- detection and secrecy to a bulk of untrusted storage. The trusted database integrates

encryption and hashing with a low-level data model that secures data and meta-data

uniformly. Further, the trusted database system uses log-structured storage by embedding a

hash tree in the comprehensive location map that forms an important part of log-structured

systems, thus enabling objects to be validated as they are located. See Maheshwari at page 2,

ll. 23 – page 3, ll. 18. Nevertheless, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Maheshwari of a

client computer including a security component having exclusive access to a log to enter

billing entries into and to secure the log.

Healy discloses a method and apparatus for online tracking whereby a user r selects a

link entry point such as a banner that refers the user to an advertiser's Internet site. The

online tracking system then records data regarding the user and the user's interaction with the

advertiser's Internet site. Ultimate performance data is collected for each referral and a score

regarding the performance of the advertisement is calculated. However, there is no

disclosure or suggestion in Healy of a client computer including a security component having exclusive access to a log to enter billing entries into and to secure the log.

Claim 1 of the present application recites a security component having exclusive access to a log to enter billing entries into the log and to secure the log. As discussed above, both Maheshwari and Healy fail to disclose or suggest a security component having exclusive access to a log to enter billing entries into the log and to secure the log. Since Maheshwari and Healy both fail to disclose or suggest such a feature, any combination of Maheshwari and Healy would also fail to disclose or suggest the feature. As a result, claim 1 is patentable over Maheshwari in view of Healy. Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and include additional features. Thus, claims 2-11 are also patentable over Maheshwari in view of Healy.

Claims 12 and 15 each recite generating a billing record at a computer system, receiving the billing record at a security component within the computer system, the security component inserting the billing record into a log. For the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claims 12 and 15 are also patentable over Tan. Claims 13-14 and 16-17 depend from claims 12 and 15, respectively, and include additional features. Thus, claims 13-14 and 16-17 are also patentable over Maheshwari in view of Healy.

Claims 18 and 23 each recite receiving an encrypted billing log at a server computer from a client computer via a secure back channel, decrypting the billing log at a security component within the server computer and storing the billing log at a database. Applicants submit that neither Maheshwari nor Healy disclose or suggest receiving an encrypted billing log at a server computer from a client computer via a secure back channel, decrypting the

billing log at a security component within the server computer and storing the billing log at a database.

Since both Maheshwari and Healy fail to disclose or suggest receiving an encrypted billing log at a server computer from a client computer via a secure back channel, decrypting the billing log at a security component within the server computer and storing the billing log at a database, any combination of Maheshwari and Healy would also fail to disclose or suggest such a feature. As a result, claims 18 and 23 are patentable over Maheshwari in view of Healy. Because claims 19-22 and 24-27 depend from claims 18 and 23, respectively, and include additional features, claims 19-22 and 24-27 are also patentable over Maheshwari in view of Healy.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: January 14, 2005

Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980

Docket No. 42P11764
Application No. 09/955,246   -9-   Application